



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/582,543 | 09/25/2000 | Karola Scheidig | P00,1147 | 2932 |

7590

02/28/2003

Hill & Simpson
85th Floor Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

VU, KIEU D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/582,543

Applicant(s)

SCHEIDIG, KAROLA

Examiner

Kieu D Vu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word "menue" in line 15 is typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullaney ("Mullaney", USP 5917484).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Mullaney teaches a method for controlling an operator interface of a computer-controlled system, comprising the steps of processing a control panel program by a computer, said control panel program defining an operator interface on a screen (400 in Fig. 4), providing a plurality of display fields on the operator interface, said plurality of display fields containing graphic elements text (402-416 in Fig. 4), storing a graphics bitmap with contains pixels corresponding to graphics element to be represented for each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 27-29), storing a plurality of language versions in text files for the text of each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 33-36), selecting one simple language for the texts of all of said plurality of display fields depending on an input instruction (col. 3, lines 62-67), loading the graphics bitmap that belong to every one of said plurality of display fields into a main memory of the computer (col. 4, lines 29-33), accessing text files of the language selected in said selecting step, and representing text pixels and pixels of the graphics bitmap together given display of the corresponding display field (Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney and Daly et al ("Daly", USP 4907282).

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Mullaney does not teach the storing bitmaps in a ROM component. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Daly. Daly teaches a

Art Unit: 2173

method for constructing, storing, and displaying characters which comprises storing bitmaps in a ROM component (col 2, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Daly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include storing bitmaps in a ROM component taught by Daly with the motivation being to enable the user to apply Mullaney's method in computer systems that are not used to display graphics.

7. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney and Evanitsky et al ("Evanitsky", USP 5045880).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Mullaney does not teach that the screen is a sensor screen. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Evanitsky. Evanitsky teaches a technique for pre-programming a reproduction machine which comprises a touch sensitive screen display to accept input from users. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Evanitsky before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include a touch sensitive screen display taught by Evanitsky with the motivation being to give the system the ability to use different types of input peripherals.

8. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney, Evanitsky, and Frary et al ("Frary", WO 90/12358).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Mullaney and Evanitsky do not teach selecting the language in the application-menu from an initial menu. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Frary. Frary teaches a multi-lingual operator control panel which

comprises selecting the language in the application-menu (Fig. 2) from an initial menu 30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Evanitsky before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney and Evanitsky to include selecting the language in the application-menu from an initial menu taught by Frary with the motivation being to enable the system to give users different ways to choose the desired language.

9. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney and Kumano ("Kumano", USP 5978754).

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Mullaney does not teach steps of reading out the new text from the appertaining text file, and displaying the text that was read out instead of the previous text without changing the graphics bitmap of the appertaining display field given a change of the language. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Kumano. Kumano teaches a translation display apparatus which comprises displaying the change in language without changing the image (Fig. 4A – 4B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Kumano before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include displaying the change in language without changing the image taught by Frary with the motivation being to use the same images for different languages.

10. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach about multi-lingual interface which relates to the claim invention.

Art Unit: 2173

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu whose telephone number is (703-605-1232). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703- 308-3116).

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7238 (After Final Communication)

or

(703)-746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703)-746-7240 (For Status Inquiries, draft communication)

and / or:

(703)-746-5639 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Kieu D. Vu

Feb 14, 2003



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2173